Nearly ferromagnetic metal state in the collapsed tetragonal phase of $YFe_2(Ge,Si)_2$

J. Srpčič,[1] P. Jeglič,[1] I. Felner,[2] Bing Lv,[3] C.W. Chu,[4] and D. Arčon[1,5,*]

[1] *Jožef Stefan Institute, Jamova c. 39, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*
[2] *Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel*
[3] *Department of Physics, The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas, 75080-3021, USA*
[4] *Department of Physics and the Texas Center for Superconductivity, University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77204-5005, USA*
[5] *Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska c. 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

arXiv:1608.01130v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 3 Aug 2016

The surprising discovery of tripling the superconducting critical temperature of KFe_2As_2 at high pressures issued an intriguing question of how the superconductivity in the collapsed tetragonal phase differs from that in the non-collapsed phases of Fe-based superconductors. Here we report ^{89}Y nuclear magnetic resonance study of $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ compounds whose electronic structure is similar to that of iron-pnictide collapsed tetragonal phases already at ambient pressure. Fe(Ge,Si) layers show strong ferromagnetic spin fluctuations whereas layers are coupled antiferromagnetically – both positioning the studied family close to a quantum critical point. Next, localized moments attributed either to Fe interstitial or antisite defects may account for magnetic impurity pair-breaking effects thus explaining the substantial variation of superconductivity among different YFe_2Ge_2 samples.

PACS numbers: 76.60.-k, 75.50.Cc, 73.43.Nq, 74.70.Xa

The collapsed tetragonal phase (CTP) found in the family of AFe_2As_2 (A = Ba, Ca, Eu, Sr, K) at high pressures has been considered as a non-superconducting phase [1], because the formation of interlayer As-As bonds triggers topological change of the Fermi surface thus removing for the superconductivity important nesting conditions [2]. This notion has suddenly changed by the recent discovery of tripling the superconducting critical temperature T_c in KFe_2As_2 at pressures higher than ~ 15 GPa when CTP is formed [3, 4]. The strong electron correlations [4] or almost perfectly nested electron and hole pockets found for KFe_2As_2 in CTP [5] were both put forward to explain the surprising enhancement of T_c. Thus, to what degree the superconducting pairing mechanism of CTP differs from that of the non-collapsed layered Fe-based phases [6] remains at present unclear.

Rare earth iron silicides and germanides of the RFe_2X_2 type (R = rare earth element, X = Ge, Si) have been studied since the 1970's for their magnetic properties – various probes showed no long-range magnetic order in this family of materials [7, 8]. The two representative compounds YFe_2Si_2 and YFe_2Ge_2 are isostructural to AFe_2As_2, i.e., they all grow in the same body-centered tetragonal crystal structure (Fig. 1a). The ratio of YFe_2Ge_2 tetragonal lattice parameters [9] is $c/a = 2.638$, which is very close to $c/a \approx 2.5$ of the high-pressure CTP in KFe_2As_2 [4]. The structural resemblance with CTP of KFe_2As_2 is reflected in the similarities of the electronic structures of the two compounds [5, 10–12]. Because of the collapsed tetragonal structure, the interlayer Ge-Ge bonds make the band structure and the Fermi surfaces of YFe_2Ge_2 more three-dimensional [11]. While nesting of hole and electron pockets, similar to KFe_2As_2, may still imply that putative superconductivity in YFe_2Ge_2 has the standard $s_\pm$ order [10], the ferromagnetic spin fluctuations within Fe-layers could promote even triplet superconductivity [11]. Reports on experimental observation of superconductivity are equally controversial. Superconductivity has been initially reported for YFe_2Ge_2 below $T_c = 1.8$ K [9]. On the other hand, no bulk superconductivity down to 1.2 K was observed in [13] and it was argued that the superconductivity has a filamentary nature [14]. However, more recent studies claimed bulk superconductivity in high quality YFe_2Ge_2 ingots with T_c strongly dependent on the sample quality [12].

The key to understanding such conflicting findings is hidden in the normal state of $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ family. First principle calculations [10, 11, 15] for YFe_2Ge_2 and YFe_2Si_2 suggested that the favorable three-dimensional magnetic order is antiferromagnetic stacking of ferromagnetic Fe-layers along the tetragonal c-axis. However, such long-range antiferromagnetic order has never been experimentally observed despite the strongly enhanced spin susceptibility in the normal state [13, 16, 17]. We note though that the sister $LuFe_2Ge_2$ compound complies with the proposed antiferromagnetic ordering at $T_N = 9$ K [16]. Hence, it has been suggested that YFe_2Ge_2 is very close to an antiferromagnetic quantum critical point [9–11, 13]. Moreover, strong quantum spin fluctuations [18, 19] and the maximum observed in the magnetization measurements across the whole family of $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ have been attributed to a nearly ferromagnetic metal state [13, 17]. Therefore, if superconductivity in YFe_2Ge_2 is indeed intrinsic, it develops from a quantum critical state where strong spin fluctuations probably play an important role in tuning T_c.

Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) has been pivotal in studies of iron-based superconductors [20–29] as well as in studies of systems close to the quantum critical point [30–37]. Here, we employ ^{89}Y NMR to probe the

normal state of $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ compounds. Data reveals that $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ are indeed very close to the quantum critical point – the c/a ratio acting as a control parameter to tune the magnetism. In tetragonal Fe-based structures with $c/a \sim 2.5$, such as $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$, CTP of KFe_2As_2 or $SrCo_2(Ge_{1-x}P_x)_2$ [38], then even small perturbations, like Fe interstitial or antisite defects discovered in this work, can have profound effect on the adopted state.

The ^{89}Y (nuclear spin $I = 1/2$) NMR spectrum of $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$ [39], taken at $T = 300$ K, shows a single line with a characteristic powder pattern of an axially symmetric shift anisotropy (Fig. 1b). Excellent fitting of the spectrum is achieved with the isotropic part of the shift $K_{\rm iso} = (2K_\perp + K_{||})/3 = -0.222\%$ and the shift anisotropy $\delta K = K_\perp - K_{||} = 0.174\%$ ($K_\perp$ and $K_{||}$ are the two principal values of the ^{89}Y NMR shift tensor $\mathbf{K}$). In general, the ^{89}Y NMR shift has two main contributions: the temperature independent chemical shift and the hyperfine shift. The former is for ^{89}Y known to be on the order of 200 ppm or even less [40], so we conclude that the main contribution to $\mathbf{K}$ arises from the hyperfine interactions of ^{89}Y with itinerant charges of Fe(Si,Ge) layer. From $K_{\rm iso} = \frac{a_{\rm iso}}{N_{\rm A}\mu_{\rm B}}\chi$ ($N_{\rm A}$ and $\mu_{\rm B}$ are the Avogadro number and the Bohr magneton, respectively) and the room temperature value of spin susceptibility $\chi = 3.3 \cdot 10^{-3}$ emu/mol we estimate the isotropic hyperfine constant to be $a_{\rm iso} = -3.8$ kOe/μ_B. This is by a factor of ~ 2 larger compared to, e.g., $YBa_2Cu_3O_{7-y}$ high-T_c superconductors [41, 42] implying strong coupling of yttrium layer to the itinerant charges in the electronically active Fe(Ge,Si) layer and consistent with a more three-dimensional band structure [11].

On cooling the ^{89}Y NMR spectra retain their axially symmetric shift anisotropy lineshape at all temperatures (Fig. 1b). The ^{89}Y NMR line first slightly shifts to even more negative values of $K_{\rm iso}$ but then below ~200 K the trend suddenly reverses and the shift, and thus also the local spin susceptibility probed by ^{89}Y, is significantly reduced compared to the room temperature value. The shift anisotropy follows the same trend, e.g., the most shifted spectrum at $T_{\rm max} = 200$ K has also the largest δK. The absence of any significant broadening of ^{89}Y NMR spectra down to lowest temperatures clearly rules out long-range magnetic ordering in $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$.

$K_{\rm iso}$ thus has a pronounced minimum (or maximum in $|K_{\rm iso}|$) at $T_{\rm max}$ (Fig. 1c) consistent with a maximum in the local spin susceptibility probed by ^{89}Y. Such non-monotonic dependence of χ strongly deviates from a simple Pauli paramagnetism in metals and is suggestive of spin correlations. The corrections to the temperature dependence of spin susceptibility of normal paramagnetic metals in the presence of spin fluctuations close to the magnetic ordering have been a subject of intense theoretical discussions [43–46]. The maximum in $\chi(T)$ is



FIG. 1. (color online). (a) The body-centered tetragonal crystal structure of $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ (space group $I4/mmm$). Here small gray, large blue and large pink spheres represent Y, Ge/Si and Fe atoms, respectively. (b) The ^{89}Y NMR spectra (thick violet lines) of polycrystalline $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$ samples at selected temperatures. Solid black line is a fit to uniaxial shift anisotropy. (c) Temperature dependence of ^{89}Y NMR shift, $K_{\rm iso}$ (circles). Solid line is a fit to Eq. (1). (d) Semi-log plot of $K_{\rm iso}$ *vs.* $T^2\ln(T/T^*)$ reveals a straight line thus corroborating with a nearly ferromagnetic metal state.

predicted as the spin susceptibility is given by

$$\chi(T) = \chi(0) - bT^2\ln(T/T^*)\,, \qquad (1)$$

where $\chi(0)$ is the Pauli spin susceptibility enhanced by enhancement factor S, T^* reflects the cutoff energies whereas prefactor b is also strongly dependent on the enhancement factor, i.e., $b \propto S^4$. Inserting Eq. (1) into the expression for $K_{\rm iso}$ yields $\chi(0) = 2.5(1) \cdot 10^{-3}$ emu/mol, $b = 0.11(1)$ emu/(mol K^2) and $T^* = 351(2)$ K. The agreement with the model is further demonstrated on a semi-log plot of $K_{\rm iso}$ *vs* $T^2\ln(T/T^*)$ where all experimental points fall on a straight line (Fig. 1d). The electronic states around the Fermi level originate from the Fe 3d derived bands [10, 11, 15] and within the first principle computations yield the bare density of states $N(0) \approx 4.5$ eV^{-1}. By comparing $\chi(0)$ to the calculated Pauli susceptibility $\chi_{\rm P} = 2.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$ emu/mol we evaluate the large Stoner enhancement factor $S = 8.6$. $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$ thus fits into a class of nearly ferromagnetic metals [13, 17].

Partial or complete replacement of Si with Ge yields isostructural YFe_2GeSi and YFe_2Ge_2 compositions. Compared to $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$, the ^{89}Y NMR spectrum of YFe_2GeSi is significantly broader and shifted to even lower resonance frequencies (Fig. 2a). The broadening could be attributed to the effects of local site disorder introduced by a random Si and Ge occupancy of



FIG. 2. (color online). ^{89}Y NMR spectra of (a) YFe_2GeSi and (b) YFe_2Ge_2 shown for some selected temperatures. Thick lines represent the experimental data, while thinner solid lines are lineshape fits.



FIG. 3. (color online). (a) Comparison of temperature dependences of the isotropic part of the ^{89}Y NMR shifts $K_{\rm iso}$ measured for $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$ (violet), YFe_2GeSi (blue) and YFe_2Ge_2 (red) powders. (b) The shift of the additional ^{89}Y resonance (circles), with the signal intensity of about 20% of the total NMR signal, follows a Curie-like temperature dependence (solid line). Inset: The dependence of temperature $T_{\rm max}$, i.e., temperature where $|K_{\rm iso}|$ has a maximum for $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ family, on the c/a ratio (solid circles). The open circle stands for $T_{\rm N} = 9$ K of $LuFe_2Ge_2$ [16].

4e crystallographic positions. On the other hand, since it is unlikely that the structural and electronic modifications within the Fe(Ge,Si) layer would considerably affect the values of ^{89}Y hyperfine constant $a_{\rm iso}$, the observed monotonic increase of the ^{89}Y shift with increasing Ge content can only reflect the enhancement of local spin susceptibilities by nearly a factor of ~ 2 when compared to $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$. The ^{89}Y NMR spectrum of YFe_2Ge_2 (Fig. 2b) is shifted even more thus implying even larger local spin susceptibilities probed by ^{89}Y NMR.

^{89}Y NMR spectra retain their axially symmetric shift anisotropy lineshape at all temperatures (Fig. 2) thus indicating that there is no structural phase transition between 300 and 15 K that would reduce the ^{89}Y 2a site symmetry in both samples. Compared to $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$ the temperature $T_{\rm max}$ where $K_{\rm iso}$ reaches its minimum (maximum in $|K_{\rm iso}|$) is systematically reduced with increasing Ge content (Fig. 3a), i.e. to $\sim$ 100 K and $\sim$ 70 K in YFe_2GeSi and YFe_2Ge_2 samples (inset to Fig. 3b), respectively. Moreover, fitting of the temperature dependences of $K_{\rm iso}$ to Eq. 1 is not satisfactory anymore. Even extensions of paramagnon models for nearly ferromagnetic metals to take into account effects of impurities [46], i.e., $\chi(T) = \chi(0) - bT^2 \ln[(T + T_{\rm imp})/T^*]$ where $T_{\rm imp}$ is related to the effects of finite mean free path on the spin fluctuations, does not improve the quality of the fit. Contrary to $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$, the ^{89}Y NMR spectra remain broad even when $|K_{\rm iso}|$ is reduced at low temperatures (e.g., compare the spectra of YFe_2Ge_2 measured at 110 and 23 K on Fig. 2b). This is indicative of the growth of local magnetic fields at ^{89}Y sites probably originating from the short-range static magnetic correlations that begin to develop in a high magnetic field of 9.34 T at low temperatures. We note that $|K_{\rm iso}|$ is suppressed at lowest temperatures, which necessitates that correlations between the nearly ferromagnetic Fe(Si,Ge) layers are of antiferromagnetic nature. Although still no long-range order is established, the analysis proves a systematic evolution of magnetism in $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ where nearly ferromagnetic metal layers for $x = 0$ becomes progressively more antiferromagnetically coupled as $x \to 2$.

Another peculiarity of the YFe_2Ge_2 sample is a pronounced shoulder in the ^{89}Y NMR spectra, which on cooling develops into a separate resonance with an extremely large shift (Fig. 2b). This spectral component is absent (or much weaker) in the other two compounds. Since all three studied samples grow in the same space group with a single crystallographic Y site there is no obvious reason for a separate ^{89}Y NMR line in this case. The intensity of this signal is about 20% of the total ^{89}Y NMR signal so it cannot be hastily attributed to some extrinsic impurity phase leading us to the conclusion that it must be intrinsic to YFe_2Ge_2. The temperature dependence of the shift (Fig. 3b) follows a perfect Curie-like dependence, i.e. $K^{\rm s}_{\rm iso} = K_0 + C/(T - T_0)$ with $K_0 = -1890$ ppm, $C = -0.89$ K and $T_0 = -48$ K thus associating this signal with ^{89}Y sites located close to some localized moments. This notion is further supported by the measurements of the spin-lattice relaxation rate, $1/T_1$, which is for this component nearly temperature independent (Fig. 4a). To explain the presence of localized paramagnetic impurities we refer here to a common feature frequently encountered also in iron-pnictide and iron-chalcogenide samples [27, 47, 48] , i.e., that some of Fe create antisite (Fe occupying Ge/Si site) or interstitial defects (Fe occupying crystallographic interstitial sites between Y and Ge layers). Due to the large moment of localized Fe defects, a strong hyperfine field with a



FIG. 4. (color online). (a) Temperature dependences of ^{89}Y spin-lattice relaxation rates $1/T_1T$ for $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ samples. (b) Test of the Korringa relation for $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$ by plotting $\sqrt{1/T_1T}$ *vs.* $K_{\rm iso}$ with temperature as an implicit parameter. (c) The decay of echo signal intensity as a function of interpulse delay time τ measured in YFe_2Ge_2 at $T = 40$ K. The solid line is a fit with $\alpha = 1.65$ (see text for details). (d) Temperature dependences of Gaussian spin-spin relaxation rates $1/T_{2G}$. Solid red line is a fit for YFe_2Ge_2 to a low-temperature power-law T^{-n} dependence with $n = 2.9(1)$. The labeling of different samples is provided in insets.

Curie-like dependence is anticipated on the nearest neighboring ^{89}Y sites in agreement with the experiment. We stress that the presence of such localized moments can provide a very efficient channel for magnetic impurity pair-breaking effects thus explaining the large variation of T_c's in different YFe_2Ge_2 samples [9, 12–14].

For systems close to an antiferromagnetic quantum critical point strong quantum spin fluctuations are responsible for a characteristic power-law dependence of spin-lattice relaxation rate, $1/T_1$, i.e., $1/T_1T \propto T^{-n}$ with $n = 3/4$ [31, 33, 35, 36]. However, for $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ the respective ^{89}Y spin-lattice relaxation rates divided by temperature, $1/T_1T$, do not show such dependence (Fig. 4a). For $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$, the temperature dependence of $1/T_1T$ resembles that of $K_{\rm iso}$, i.e., it exhibits a broad maximum at ~ 200 K. For correlated metals where electron-electron exchange enhancement effects are important, the Korringa relation reads [49]

$$T_1TK_{\rm iso}^2 = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi k_{\rm B}}\frac{\gamma_{\rm e}^2}{\gamma_{89}^2}\beta\,. \qquad (2)$$

Here $\gamma_{\rm e}$ and γ_{89} are the electronic and ^{89}Y gyromagnetic ratios, respectively. The Korringa factor β is introduced to account for the electron-electron exchange in a strongly correlated metal [49, 50]. Plotting $\sqrt{1/T_1T}$ *vs.* $K_{\rm iso}$ we find the expected linear dependence (Fig. 4b) yielding $\beta = 8.3$. Such strong enhancement is arising from the in-plane ferromagnetic fluctuations thus corroborating the nearly ferromagnetic metal state. The spin-lattice relaxation rates of YFe_2GeSi and YFe_2Ge_2 are even more enhanced implying even larger $\beta > 15$. However, the nearly constant $1/T_1T$ does not scale with the temperature dependent $K_{\rm iso}^2$ giving a strong indication for a Fermi-liquid breakdown for these two samples.

On the other hand, the effect of inter-plane antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations is clearly absent in $1/T_1$ data because such spin fluctuations are filtered out at the highly symmetric yttrium position. This explains why $1/T_1T$ is temperature independent for YFe_2GeSi and YFe_2Ge_2 despite the indications for antiferromagnetic correlations between layers given by the temperature dependence of $K_{\rm iso}$. To confirm antiferormagnetic correlations between layers we finally turn to ^{89}Y spin-spin relaxation rates, $1/T_2$. We first fitted the envelope of the echo decay $S(\tau)$ as a function of the interpulse delay time τ to a phenomenological expression $S(\tau) = S_0\exp[-(2\tau/T_2)^{\alpha}]$ (Fig. 4c). Here S_0 is the initial echo intensity signal whereas the parameter α expresses the relative contributions of the Redfield and the Gaussian part of the echo decay [49, 51]. We obtain $\alpha \approx 1.6$, showing that both relaxation channels are present and comparable. Therefore, in the next step we employed the procedure of [51] to extract the Gaussian part of the decay, T_{2G}. As anticipated, $1/T_{2G}$ is constant at high temperatures for all samples (Fig. 4d). However, at low temperatures $1/T_{2G}$ nearly diverges for YFe_2Ge_2 and YFe_2GeSi, whereas it is only slightly enhanced for $YFe_2Ge_{0.2}Si_{1.8}$. Below 100 K, $1/T_{2G}$ is for YFe_2Ge_2 fitted to $1/T_{2G} = 1/T_2^0 + BT^{-n}$ with a power exponent $n = 2.9(1)$. This is reminiscent to cuprates, where Gaussian contribution to the echo decay is proportional to the antiferromagnetic correlation length ξ, i.e., $1/T_{2G} \propto \xi$ [49, 51–53]. The low-temperature enhancement in $1/T_{2G}$ thus demonstrates the build-up of antiferromagnetic correlations between ferromagnetic Fe(Ge,Si) layers proving the vicinity of antiferromagnetic quantum critical point in Ge-rich samples.

The $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ family displays strong ferromagnetic fluctuations within the Fe(Ge,Si) layers and antiferromagnetic correlations between layers. These correlations grow in importance with $x \to 2$ thus suggesting that with the introduction of slightly larger Ge ions the change in the c/a ratio is sufficient ($c/a = 2.54$, 2.56 and 2.64 for $x = 0.2, 1$ and 2 samples, respectively) to strengthen the inter-layer coupling. The trend is additionally supported by the long range antiferromagnetic order below 9 K in $LuFe_2Ge_2$ ($c/a = 2.66$) [16]. YFe_2Ge_2 (and probably also YFe_2GeSi) thus must be very close to the quantum critical point (inset to Fig. 3b) therefore accounting for the enhanced quantum spin fluctuations. We stress that a similar Ge-Ge bonding strength acting as a tuning parameter to induce the quantum critical point has been reported for $SrCo_2(Ge_{2-x}P_x)_2$, which likewise

belongs to the same layered tetragonal $ThCr_2Si_2$ structure type [38]. When quantum critical point separates the magnetic and superconducting phases, even small perturbations introduced by defect localized moments, such as those reported here, may have profound effect on the ground state. Although there is no NMR data available for a comparison with the high-pressure CTP phase of KFe_2As_2, our results prove a fundamentally different normal state of $YFe_2Ge_xSi_{2-x}$ compared to that of the superconducting iron-pnictides. It is therefore unlikely that superconductivity in YFe_2Ge_2 follows the same scenarios as those discussed for iron-pnictides [6].

D.A. acknowledges the financial support by the Slovenian Research Agency, grant No. N1-0052. B. L and C. W. C acknowledge the financial support by US Air Force Office of Scientific Research Grants No. FA9550-15-1-0236.

* e-mail: denis.arcon@ijs.si

[1] D. K. Pratt, Y. Zhao, S. A. J. Kimber, A. Hiess, D. N. Argyriou, C. Broholm, A. Kreyssig, S. Nandi, S. L. Bud'ko, N. Ni, et al., Phys. Rev. B **79**, 060510 (2009), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.79.060510.

[2] A. I. Coldea, C. M. J. Andrew, J. G. Analytis, R. D. McDonald, A. F. Bangura, J.-H. Chu, I. R. Fisher, and A. Carrington, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 026404 (2009), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.026404.

[3] Y. Nakajima, R. Wang, T. Metz, X. Wang, L. Wang, H. Cynn, S. T. Weir, J. R. Jeffries, and J. Paglione, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 060508 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.060508.

[4] J.-J. Ying, L.-Y. Tang, V. V. Struzhkin, H.-K. Mao, A. G. Gavriliuk, A.-F. Wang, X.-H. Chen, and C. Xiao-Jia, arXiv:1501.00330 **(unpublished)** (2015), URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1501.00330.

[5] D. Guterding, S. Backes, H. O. Jeschke, and R. Valentí, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 140503 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.140503.

[6] H. Hosono and K. Kuroki, Physica C: Superconductivity and its Applications **514**, 399 (2015), superconducting Materials: Conventional, Unconventional and Undetermined, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921453415000477.

[7] I. Felner, I. Mayer, A. Grill, and M. Schieber, Solid State Communications **16**, 1005 (1975), URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0038109875900407.

[8] H. Pinto and H. Shaked, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 3261 (1973), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.7.3261.

[9] Y. Zou, Z. Feng, P. W. Logg, J. Chen, G. Lampronti, and F. M. Grosche, physica status solidi (RRL) Rapid Research Letters **8**, 928 (2014), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pssr.201409418.

[10] A. Subedi, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 024504 (2014), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.89.024504.

[11] D. J. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 024505 (2014), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.89.024505.

[12] J. Chen, K. Semeniuk, Z. Feng, P. Reiss, P. Brown, Y. Zou, P. W. Logg, G. I. Lampronti, and F. M. Grosche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 127001 (2016), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.127001.

[13] I. Felner, B. Lv, K. Zhao, and C. W. Chu, Journal of Superconductivity and Novel Magnetism **28**, 1207 (2015), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10948-015-3011-z.

[14] H. Kim, S. Ran, E. Mun, H. Hodovanets, M. Tanatar, R. Prozorov, S. Budko, and P. Canfield, Philosophical Magazine **95**, 804 (2015), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14786435.2015.1004378.

[15] D. J. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 245155 (2016), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.245155.

[16] M. Avila, S. Bud'ko, and P. Canfield, Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials **270**, 51 (2004), URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030488530

[17] I. Felner, B. Lv, and C. W. Chu, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **26**, 476002 (2014), URL http://stacks.iop.org/0953-8984/26/i=47/a=476002.

[18] N. Sirica, F. Bondino, S. Nappini, I. Píš, L. Poudel, A. D. Christianson, D. Mandrus, D. J. Singh, and N. Mannella, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 121102 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.121102.

[19] J. Ferstl, H. Rosner, and C. Geibel, Physica B: Condensed Matter **378380**, 744 (2006), proceedings of the International Conference on Strongly Correlated Electron SystemsSCES 2005Proceedings of the International Conference on Strongly Correlated Electron Systems, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S092145260

[20] H.-J. Grafe, D. Paar, G. Lang, N. J. Curro, G. Behr, J. Werner, J. Hamann-Borrero, C. Hess, N. Leps, R. Klingeler, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 047003 (2008), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.047003.

[21] T. Imai, K. Ahilan, F. Ning, M. A. McGuire, A. S. Sefat, R. Jin, B. C. Sales, and D. Mandrus, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **77**, 47 (2008), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/JPSJS.77SC.47.

[22] S. Kawasaki, K. Shimada, G. F. Chen, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang, and G.-q. Zheng, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 220506 (2008), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.78.220506.

[23] P. Jeglič, J.-W. G. Bos, A. Zorko, M. Brunelli, K. Koch, H. Rosner, S. Margadonna, and D. Arčon, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094515 (2009), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.79.094515.

[24] Y. Nakai, S. Kitagawa, K. Ishida, Y. Kamihara, M. Hirano, and H. Hosono, New Journal of Physics **11**, 045004 (2009), URL http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/11/i=4/a=045004.

[25] P. Jeglič, A. Potočnik, M. Klanjšek, M. Bobnar, M. Jagodič, K. Koch, H. Rosner, S. Margadonna, B. Lv, A. M. Guloy, et al., Phys. Rev. B **81**, 140511 (2010), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.81.140511.

[26] M. Klanjšek, P. Jeglič, B. Lv, A. M. Guloy, C. W. Chu, and D. Arčon, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 054528 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.84.054528.

[27] M. Majcen Hrovat, P. Jeglič, M. Klanjšek, T. Hatakeda, T. Noji, Y. Tanabe, T. Urata, K. K. Huynh, Y. Koike, K. Tanigaki, et al., Phys. Rev. B **92**, 094513 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.92.094513.

[28] L. Ma, G. F. Ji, J. Dai, X. R. Lu, M. J. Eom, J. S. Kim, B. Normand, and W. Yu,

Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 197002 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.197002.

[29] P. Wiecki, B. Roy, D. C. Johnston, S. L. Bud'ko, P. C. Canfield, and Y. Furukawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 137001 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.137001.

[30] K. Ishida, K. Okamoto, Y. Kawasaki, Y. Kitaoka, O. Trovarelli, C. Geibel, and F. Steglich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 107202 (2002), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.107202.

[31] R. Sarkar, P. Khuntia, C. Krellner, C. Geibel, F. Steglich, and M. Baenitz, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 140409 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.85.140409.

[32] P. Khuntia, A. M. Strydom, L. S. Wu, M. C. Aronson, F. Steglich, and M. Baenitz, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 220401 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.86.220401.

[33] T. Misawa, Y. Yamaji, and M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **78**, 084707 (2009), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.78.084707.

[34] A. Ishigaki and T. Moriya, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65**, 3402 (1996), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.65.3402.

[35] T. Moriya and T. Takimoto, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **64**, 960 (1995), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.64.960.

[36] A. Ishigaki and T. Moriya, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **65**, 3402 (1996), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.65.3402.

[37] D. Arčon, L. M. Schoop, R. J. Cava, and C. Felser, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 104413 (2016), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.104413.

[38] S. Jia, P. Jiramongkolchai, M. R. Suchomel, B. H. Toby, J. G. Checkelsky, N. P. Ong, and R. J. Cava, Nat. Phys. **7**, 207 (2011), URL http://www.nature.com/nphys/journal/v7/n3/abs/nphys1868.html.

[39] J. Srpčič et al., *See supplemental material for details of sample preparation, characterization and the nmr methods.*

[40] T. Aharen, J. E. Greedan, C. A. Bridges, A. A. Aczel, J. Rodriguez, G. MacDougall, G. M. Luke, T. Imai, V. K. Michaelis, S. Kroeker, et al., Phys. Rev. B **81**, 224409 (2010), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.81.224409.

[41] M. Takigawa, W. L. Hults, and J. L. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2650 (1993), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.2650.

[42] H. Alloul, A. Mahajan, H. Casalta, and O. Klein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1171 (1993), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.1171.

[43] M. T. Béal-Monod, S.-K. Ma, and D. R. Fredkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20**, 929 (1968), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.20.929.

[44] S. Misawa, Physics Letters A **32**, 153 (1970), URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0375960170

[45] G. Barnea, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics **8**, L216 (1975), URL http://stacks.iop.org/0022-3719/8/i=10/a=001.

[46] G. Barnea, Journal of Physics F: Metal Physics **7**, 315 (1977), URL http://stacks.iop.org/0305-4608/7/i=2/a=013.

[47] H. Sun, D. N. Woodruff, S. J. Cassidy, G. M. Allcroft, S. J. Sedlmaier, A. L. Thompson, P. A. Bingham, S. D. Forder, S. Cartenet, N. Mary, et al., Inorganic Chemistry **54**, 1958 (2015), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ic5028702.

[48] U. Pachmayr, F. Nitsche, H. Luetkens, S. Kamusella, F. Brckner, R. Sarkar, H.-H. Klauss, and D. Johrendt, Angewandte Chemie International Edition **54**, 293 (2015), URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.201407756.

[49] R. E. Walstedt, *The NMR Probe of High-Tc Materials*, vol. 228 of *Springer Tracts in Modern Physics* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008), URL http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-540-75565-4.

[50] C. H. Pennington and V. A. Stenger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 855 (1996), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.68.855.

[51] A. J. Curro, T. Imai, C. P. Slichter, and B. Dabrowski, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 877 (1997), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.56.877.

[52] V. Barzykin and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 13585 (1995), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.52.13585.

[53] C. H. Pennington and C. P. Slichter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 381 (1991), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.66.381.